DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 114 JC 820 371

AUTHOR Henderson, Leon N., Jr.
TITLE The Status of the Open Door: Florida's Community Colleges in the 1980s.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Attitude Change; *Community Colleges; Educational Opportunities; *Open Enrollment; Policy Formation; *Public Opinion; *Public Policy; Questionnaires; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

In 1982, a study was conducted to assess the open door philosophy operating in Florida's community colleges and changes in the policy from 1957 to 1981. Fourteen political and educational leaders were interviewed and asked to: (1) describe the original purposes of the open door philosophy and the factors behind its establishment; (2) assess the implementation of Florida's master plan; (3) evaluate initial support for the open door philosophy among policy makers and citizens; (4) identify social or economic changes and problems that had affected the policy; (5) identify stated and real reasons behind opposition to the philosophy in 1981; and (6) describe the open door philosophy of the 1980s. The respondents indicated that the policy was implemented to provide college-level education to a large number of state citizens, including high school graduates and those facing geographical and financial barriers. They felt the state's Master Plan of 1957 contributed most to the implementation of the policy and that support had lessened since then due mainly to social and economic changes. They indicated that though the policy was operating satisfactorily, except in the provision of counseling services, it would not continue to exist as it had in the 1970s. Additionally, they felt that since 1957 vocational preparation, basic skills, retraining, and college accountability had become more significant, while questions of access and program diversity and innovation had lost importance. Data and the questionnaire are appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219114

THE STATUS OF THE OPEN DOOR

FLORIDA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

IN THE 1980s

by

Leon N. Henderson, Jr.

Institute of Higher Education

Gainesville, Florida

1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 371

FOREWORD

The keystone to the community college program has been the open door policy. This basic philosophy embraced by those who wished to provide equity in educational opportunity has been a major commitment of Florida's community college program since its early beginnings. The purposes of Palm Beach Junior College and St. Petersburg Junior College in the 1930's were stressed as providing a chance to continue education to those youth who were unable to pull together adequate financial means to attend the universities. The expansion of the community colleges to other Florida counties during the 1950s and 1960s was made possible by continuing legislative and gubernatorial commitments. The Florida Master Plan approved by the State Board of Education and the Florida Legislature in 1957 focused upon this open door policy. Several studies of faculty attitudes reinforced this concerned commitment for the open door.

Dr. Henderson's study is an excellent analysis of the ways in which public policy may be altered or changed perhaps even without intention. This analysis deserves the attention of the leadership in Florida who will want to be aware of the direction "incrementalism" may be leading this state.

We very much appreciate the cooperation of the key informants and of the Postsecondary Education Commission's staff as well as the Division of Community Colleges in conducting this study.

James L. Wattenbarger

Gainesville, Florida
August, 1982

INTRODUCTION

Background

Florida utilizes the open door philosophy to extend educational opportunity to its citizens. The open door philosophy was adopted as part of the master plan for a system of community colleges (Community College Council, 1957). The open door has played an important part in providing educational opportunity since the establishment of the system of community colleges.

The open door policy in Florida has recently received publicity (Braziel & Crane, 1981; McCabe, 1981) for recent local modifications to the concept. As Associated Press story in a Florida newspaper (Braziel & Crane, 1981) reported that "the nation's largest junior college is sweeping thousands of incompetent students back out through its "open door" to prevent any further decline in educational standards" (pp. 1A, 12A). The president of Miami-Dade Community College (McCabe, 1981) stated in an article entitled, "Now Is the Time To Reform the American Community College" that

> community colleges currently face a dilemma which mirrors our society. It is becoming clear that there exists a paradox between the goal of equal opportunity for all, and the growing feeling on the part of many Americans that taxpayers can no longer afford to support all of the programs designed to attain this goal. Many feel that the social programs attempted in recent decades have been ineffective, that they have placed too great a burden on middle-income Americans. Further, there is a widely held belief that many individuals are taking advantage of social programs by accepting funds without putting forth the effort to improve themselves that should be expected. Further evidence of dissatisfaction is reflected at the community college level in the current demand by the public for higher standards and serious questioning of the open door policies. (pp. 7-8)

The local modifications are indications of possible changes in the commitment of policy makers to provide educational opportunity to citizens. Commitment by policy makers could very well have shifted to reflect the reported growing desire for standards and accountability.

Purpose

A study by Henderson (1982) determined whether or not policy making pertaining to implementation of the open door philosophy from 1957 to 1981 was incremental in nature. Data in the study was obtained through interviews with key informants knowledgeable of policy making during this period.

The purpose of this report is to summarize responses to questions and ratings by key informants in the previous study that pertain to perceived policy maker support of the open door philosophy from 1957 to 1981.

Statutory Implementation of the Open Door Philosophy

The study by Henderson (1982) reviewed Florida's master plan for community colleges and identified five aspects of the plan's approach to provide educational opportunity. The five aspects, defined as Florida's open door philosophy were

1. Provide educational opportunity to all persons
2. Provide financial accessibility
3. Provide geographic accessibility
4. Provide diversity of programs
5. Provide effective counseling services.

Henderson (1982) also examined session laws between 1957 and 1981 and identified 41 different laws which pertained to the five aspects of the open door philosophy. Of these laws, five were found to pertain specifically to providing educational opportunity to all persons, 15 were found to pertain specifically to providing financial accessibility, 20 were found to pertain specifically to providing geographic accessibility, seven were found to pertain specifically to providing a diversity of programs, and one was found to pertain specifically to providing effective counseling services. A number of laws were found to pertain to more than one aspect of the open door philosophy. Thus, 48 laws were examined that pertained to the five different aspects of the open door philosophy.

Henderson (1982) summarized the number of laws and determined the percentage of laws by particular aspect and by all five aspects of the open door philosophy prior to and after 1970. Table 1, taken from the study, shows that of the 48 laws rated in the study pertaining to the open door philosophy, 50 percent were passed prior to 1970 and 50 percent were passed after 1970. Of the laws passed prior to 1970, four percent pertained to providing educational opportunity to all; 12 percent, to providing financial accessibility; 75 percent, to providing geographic accessibility; eight percent, to providing a diversity of programs, and none to providing effective counseling services. Of the laws passed after 1970, 17 percent pertained to providing educational opportunity to all persons; 50 percent, to providing financial accessibility; eight percent, to providing geographic accessibility; 21 percent, to providing a diversity of programs; and four percent, to providing effective counseling services.

Table 1

Number of Laws and Percent of Laws by Individual Aspect and by All Five Aspects of the Open Door Philosophy, Prior to and After 1970

Aspect of the open door philosophy	Prior to 1970			After 1970			Total
	Number	%[a]	%[b]	Number	%[c]	%[d]	
Provide educational opportunity to all persons	1	20	4	4	80	17	5
Provide financial accessibility	3	20	12	12	80	50	15
Provide geographic accessibility	18	90	75	2	10	8	20
Provide diversity of programs	2	28	8	5	71	21	7
Provide effective counseling services	0	0	0	1	100	4	1
Total number of laws	24			24			48

[a]Percent of laws passed prior to 1970 pertaining to a particular aspect of the open door philosophy.
[b]Percent of laws passed prior to 1970 pertaining to all aspects of the open door philosophy.
[c]Percent of laws passed after 1970 pertaining to a particular aspect of the open door philosophy.
[d]Percent of laws passed after 1970 pertaining to all aspects of the open door philosophy.

Examination of the session laws pertaining to all areas except those relating to providing geographic access revealed that 79 percent of the session laws rated were passed after 1970 and only 21 percent were passed prior to 1970 (Henderson, 1982). Stated differently, of the 28 laws, 22 were passed after 1970 and only six prior to 1970. This was because there were 18 total laws rated in the study which pertained to providing geographic access. Ninety percent of these were passed prior to 1970, ten percent after 1970.

Overall, the emphasis of the laws examined by Henderson (1982), was upon providing financial accessibility through scholarships and loans, providing geographic accessibility, and providing a diversity of programs. The laws did not emphasize providing educational opportunity to all persons, providing financial accessibility through low or no tuition, or providing effective counseling services.

RESPONSES

This report presents the responses to questions and ratings that pertain to perceived policy maker support of the open door philosophy from 1957 to 1981. The responses were obtained as a part of a study by Henderson (1982). The responses are organized according to (a) a description of Florida's open door philosophy, (b) the rationale for the philosophy, (c) the implementation of the master plan, and (d) the open door in 1981. The questions and ratings utilized in this report are presented in Appendix A.

The interviews and ratings were conducted over a period of 30 days. Of the 16 individuals invited to participate in the interviews, 14 were actually interviewed. Of these 14, two expressed unfamiliarity with the open door philosophy in 1981. One individual expressed unfamiliarity with the open door philosophy in 1957. Several were reluctant to complete the ratings because of their unfamiliarity with either the early or later implementation of the philosophy. The individuals interviewed for the original study and this report are listed in Appendix B.

Description of Florida's Open Door Philosophy

The key informants were asked to describe the open door philosophy as it was originally proposed and the population it was designed to serve. The key informants stated that the initial establishment of the open door philosophy of Florida's system of community colleges came about as a result of recognition by policy makers in the 1950s of a number of needs of the state. The largest single need was to provide college-level education to a large number of citizens of the state. These citizens consisted of (a) those who

were currently willing to attend college but who for some geographic, financial, or motivational reason were unable to attend, and (b) those persons who would be of college age during the next decade. Coupled with the need to provide a college-level education to this number of persons was the recognition by policy makers of the inability of the existing universities to provide education at a low cost and be able physically to handle the estimated numbers of students soon to be of college age. An additional realization was stressed by key informants. Policy makers realized the high cost both to the students and to the state if the traditional university models of education were utilized; for example, the university model included dorms and other capital outlay expenses. The key informants acknowledged that they were concerned during the mid-1950s with the tremendous potential expense to the state if the present universities were expanded to meet the growing needs of providing a college education to this increasing population. They also acknowledged that expansion of the present universities would not meet the needs of this particular group of citizens seeking a college-level education. One key informant expressed the overall problem as a load that was thrust upon them that was too big for the universities to handle. The policy makers of the early 1950s were forced to find new ways to deal with the problem.

The second largest need of the mid-1950s recognized by the key informants was concerned with vocational (trade) and technical training. Two aspects of the need were identified: to provide vocational and technical training to a growing number of individuals, and to improve the existing vocational and technical training offered by the state.

A third need mentioned by the key informants was to provide a system of education through which persons could continue their education beyond

high school. Some of the key informants reported that high schools at the time had only partially prepared students for jobs or for continuing their education.

The key informants also mentioned that, during the mid-1950s, there were no institutions that served students who were academically or emotionally unprepared for a residential state university. The community college was viewed as the educational institution which could provide support for these students prior to, or following, their attendance at a state university. Private community colleges had been fulfilling this role to some degree prior to the latter 1950s.

Policy makers during the mid-1950s were aware of other trends which contributed to the initial formulation of the open door philosophy. Two emerging trends existed at the time. Community college administrators were accepting students into their institutions who were less well prepared than the typical college applicant, with the hopes of effectively preparing them for continued education or vocational training. University administrators were tending to be more selective of their students as competition for space in the university developed.

Rationale for the Establishment of the Open Door Philosophy

Key informants were asked what really brought about the establishment of the open door in Florida. Was the open door established because there was dissatisfaction with existing conditions or policies or for other reasons? Key informants were also asked to rate the contribution of a number of policy-making positions, policy documents, or other phenomena to the implementation and support of the open door philosophy in both 1957 and 1981.

The open door philosophy was not as reported by key informants established out of dissatisfaction with existing conditions or policies. It was reported by the key informants to have been established more or less as a rational policy response to the need to provide education to large numbers of citizens of the state. The conditions existing in the state at the time challenged the policy makers to identify a method of overcoming these conditions. There was no dissatisfaction with existing conditions. The feeling was more of a recognition that the system had to be improved to meet growing needs.

The open door philosophy or focus of providing educational opportunity was thought by the key informants to have been established for two equally important purposes: (a) to provide opportunity to those persons of limited economic resources by ensuring geographic and financial access and a choice of program opportunity, and (b) to ensure access to higher education to all graduates of Florida high schools. The open door philosophy was viewed by the key informants as serving both the traditional college-age student as well as the older student who had already entered the work force, for the purpose of allowing these students to obtain either college-transfer or a vocational/technical education.

Many of the key informants indicated that the original primary function of Florida's system of community colleges was to serve the college transfer student. These key informants reported that the serving of the vocational and technical student was of secondary importance and that these programs, in fact, developed during the 1960s following the establishment of the system. Other key informants indicated that there was no emphasis on one program over another by the junior colleges; both the vocational or technical programs and

the college transfer programs were given the same support by policy makers. One point continually made by the key informants during the interviews was that each individual community-junior college in the system had a different focus or direction which was the result of uniquely different histories or emphases by the local school boards.

The policy statement which eventually provided the support and direction for the needed educational opportunity was the master plan for community colleges, written in 1957. The master plan was considered by all of the key informants to be the blueprint for the development of the system. A large factor in explaining the support of policy makers for the master plan during its implementation was the plan's design for the establishment of additional community-junior colleges. The master plan offered the means by which local areas could establish locally controlled colleges. According to one key informant, this opportunity politically united all of the parochial interests of the state.

Table 2 shows the frequency of the ratings by the key informants of the extent that each policy-making position, policy document, or other phenomena contributed to the implementation and support of the open door philosophy in 1957. The master plan was rated by the key informants as the largest contributor to the implementation and support of the open door philosophy in 1957. Early satisfaction with the open door philosophy of the master plan is indirectly indicated by the large support in 1957 (shown in Table 8) by the governor and legislature. Justification for support of the open door was to a large extent due to (a) a policy maker concern to address the projected need for skilled workers, (b) the opinion that the open door philosophy represented the best policy choice, and (c) the conscientious effort to

Table 2

Key Informants' Ratings of the Extent to Which Each Policy-Making Position Policy Document and Other Contributed to the Implementation of the Open Door Philosophy in 1957

	Frequency of rating							
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
	None	Very Small	Small	Some	Large	Very Large	Mean	N
The governor	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.8	13
The legislature	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.9	13
Citizens	1	0	0	6	5	2	3.7	13
The state universities	1	2	4	3	3	0	2.4	13
The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947)	2	1	2	7	1	0	2.3	13
The master plan for Florida's system of community colleges (1957)	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.7	13
The need to shift open door admissions from universities	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.3	12
Demands from employers for skilled workers	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.5	12
The projected need for skilled workers	0	0	1	1	9	1	3.8	12
Peer pressure of policy-maker	0	0	2	7	3	1	3.4	13
Best policy choice	0	0	0	4	8	1	3.7	13
Conscientious effort to provide educational opportunity to all persons	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.8	13

provide educational opportunity to all persons.

Table 3 shows the frequency of the ratings by the key informants that each policy-making position, policy document, or other phenomena contributed to the support of the open door in 1981. The master plan was no longer viewed by policy makers as being a large contributor to the implementation of the master plan. Support for the philosophy by the governor and the legislature was less than the support rated for 1957. Justification for support of the open door in 1981 centered mainly on the projected need for skilled workers.

Table 3

Key Informants' Ratings of the Extent to Which Each Policy-Making Position Policy Document and Other Contributed to the Implementation of the Open Door Philosophy in 1981

	Frequency of rating							
	(0) None	(1) Very Small	(2) Small	(3) Some	(4) Large	(5) Very Large	Mean	N
The governor	0	0	0	7	3	1	3.4	11
The legislature	0	0	2	6	3	0	3.1	11
Citizens	0	0	2	3	5	0	3.3	10
The state universities	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.2	9
The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947)	2	1	6	1	0	0	1.6	10
The master plan for Florida's system of community colleges (1957)	1	0	3	4	1	1	2.7	10
The need to shift open door admissions from universities	1	0	1	4	5	0	3.1	11
Demands from employers for skilled workers	0	0	1	2	7	0	3.3	11
The projected need for skilled workers	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.0	11
Peer pressure of policy-maker	0	1	3	5	1	0	2.5	10
Best policy choice	0	0	5	3	3	0	2.8	11
Conscientious effort to provide educational opportunity to all persons	0	0	3	4	4	0	3.1	11

Implementation of the Master Plan

Key informants were asked a number of questions concerned with the implemenation of the master plan. Firstly, they were asked: Was there a conscientious effort by policy makers to follow the master plan? If there was an effort, how long did the effort last? What brought a halt to the efforts if there was halt? Secondly, key informants were asked: How strong was the initial support for the open door philosophy among policy makers and among citizens? Thirdly, they were asked: What social or economic changes have occurred within the state or society since 1957 that affected the open door philosophy. Fourthly, they were asked: Have the problems in making the open door philosophy work, changed since 1957 and how have they changed?

The key informants reported that there was a conscientious effort by policy makers to follow the master plan through the 1960s. Almost all of the key informants reported that they believed that the master plan's primary intent was the geographic establishment of 28 community college districts including their physical campuses. The establishment of the 28 districts was completed in 1968. Many of the key informants considered the master plan to have been complete at that time. The majority of the key informants reported that they believed the development of the open door philosophy and the development of the system of community colleges were one and the same. These two developments were so closely tied together that many of the key informants perceived that the policy makers did not separate the two; the system was more than the means to provide the open door or opportunity; it <u>was</u> the open door and opportunity. Thus, to the majority of policy makers, completion of the 28 districts signaled completion of the

master plan. A few key informants indicated that, because the master plan was complete, the open door philosophy was thus considered complete.

Satisfaction with the open door philosophy continued through the 1970s. Only a few policy makers indicated that there was dissatisfaction with the open door philosophy in 1981. But many key informants indicated that an uneasiness with the open door philosophy was evident during the early 1970s. One indication of this uneasiness was the legislature's gradual abandonment of the automatic recalculation of full-time equivalents (F.T.E.s) following the end of the academic terms.

Generally, the key informants indicated that there was strong initial support for the open door philosophy among policy makers. They also indicated that citizens, while being generally supportive of the open door philosophy and the master plan, had had no reason to be either exceptionally supportive or nonsupportive or to be concerned with the values and objectives of the plan.

Opinions of the key informants indicated that the disagreements of policy makers over the need for the open door philosophy and the nature of the philosophy during the implementation of the master plan had been small or nonexistent. A few of the key informants mentioned specific areas of disagreement: (a) the funding of area vocational and technical centers in 1963 in addition to the junior colleges, (b) the early push by some junior colleges to become four-year institutions, and (c) the early effort, due to the foreseeable changes in segregation policies, to design a dual campus system which could at a later date be easily combined into an integrated system.

Policy makers indicated that several social or economic changes had occurred within the state or country since 1957 which affected the open door philosophy. Each change reportedly presented a unique problem in implementing the open door philosophy or served to support the need for the open door philosophy, or both.

The open door philosophy and Florida's system of community colleges were established during a period of racial segregation. The system was established with dual campuses in some of the districts. The key informants expressed no recollection of major problems with the dual system since this was the method in which public schools in the state had operated until the late 1960s. The federal civil rights legislation and the resulting move toward providing greater opportunity to all races led to the more equitable providing of educational opportunity to all persons. One key informant stated that the federal legislation ensured that the door was indeed open. The creation of single colleges in each district and the providing of opportunity to all races, however, created instructional problems within some individual colleges. Some policy makers reported that they believed the junior colleges were unprepared to teach and meet the needs of the black student. Several of the key informants stated that the junior colleges made every attempt, nonetheless, to teach and provide opportunity to all persons.

Other social and technological changes impacted upon the system and the open door philosophy. The key informants stated that during the 1960s and 1970s the growth of the system was great. A number of changes within the state and country brough an ever-increasing number of persons to the colleges seeking education and training through the open door. The changes also brought growth problems to the community colleges through their attempt to

provide opportunity. The trends mentioned by the key informants which served to challenge the system to provide greater opportunity were (a) an expansion of work opportunities for women, (b) an increase in the tendency for both the adults in families to seek and hold jobs in order to provide greater family income, (c) an increase in the country's overall reliance upon technology supported by skilled workers, (d) an increase in the industrial growth of the state, (e) an overall increase in reliance upon skilled health care, (f) an increase in the mobility of the population, (g) the explosion of new knowledge and informantion, (h) an increase in the trend of licensing skilled and semi-professional workers, (i) an increase in the middle-aged and senior citizen population, and (j) an increase in the number of minorities seeking education and training.

Also mentioned by the key informants was a change, beginning in the 1970s, in the involvement of the state in the accrediting of educational programs. The role of traditional private accrediting agencies began to take on less importance as the state's role of assuming responsibility for program accountability increased. A few key informants indicated that the result of the state's new role was an increase in the interest of some policy makers in the state in determining entrance requirements for programs offered by the community colleges. This increased interest followed the development of program exit criteria for the secondary schools and the thinking by some policy makers that there should be a common body of knowledge to demonstrate program completion.

Other changes mentioned by the key informants were concerned with economic changes in the state and country. A tightening economy and a halt

in economic growth caused many policy makers to realize that the state could not do everything for everybody, as one key informant expressed it. The majority of the key informants reported that the economy caused the state to make decisions and spending priorities which affected the open door philosophy.

One key informant also mentioned the realization by policy makers in the 1970s that community colleges by themselves could not win the war on poverty or teach all persons to read and write. This realization led to a reexamination of the open door philosophy and, possibly, a relaxation in the defense of the philosophy by policy makers.

Most of the key informants indicated that the overall problems of making the open door work had not changed since 1957. Some of the key informants, however, indicated that the problems of making the open door work had changed since 1957. These key informants stated that the initial problems of the open door were concerned with establishing the system of community colleges, the programs, and the campuses which alleviated the geographic, financial, and motivational barriers to opportunity. Several key informants cited specific initial problems. Both the continuous and substantial growth and the attempt to educate adults of all ages in all programs were perceived as problems by one key informant. One key informant indicated that there was a problem of teaching the unprepared student. Another key informant indicated that obtaining money to support the system had always been a problem. Recent problems have been concerned more with motivating students to continue their education than with structuring the system to provide access. One key informant indicated that the philosophical commitment to help the individual succeed was stronger in 1981 than it was in 1957. Another key informant

indicated that in 1981 there was a realization of a need for standards which was not recognized as a problem in 1957.

Most of the key informants reported that the concerns or priorities of people in 1957 had changed by 1981, creating a change in the external problems (as opposed to internal problems) of making the open door work. The key informants reported that the inherent internal problems of making the open door work had never really existed and thus there had been no change. The concerns of people which had changed and which led to the external problems of making the open door work were (a) a concern over the state's financial responsibility for providing postsecondary education for all persons, (b) a concern for program accountability or results as measured by the placement of graduates in jobs or the measured skills of graduates, and (c) the greater concern for equal access and equal opportunity as measured by numbers of each race or cultural group in a program.

A few key informants indicated that the articulation agreement with the state universities was becoming a problem. Only one key informant indicated that articulation was an earlier problem which had been solved with the formulation of an articulation agreement.

It was emphasized by several key informants that the shift in institutional control from locally elected school boards and elected superintendents to appointed boards of trustees was a positive step in reducing any internal problems with the open door. The reasons given were that there was more understanding and stability and in increase in concern for the unique problems of the community colleges. One key informant emphasized the shift in

financial support of institutions from the local to the state level. This was seen as positive because it provided the opportunity to offer higher salaries in order to attract and retain better-qualified faculty members. The shift in control by school boards and local financial support to control by boards of trustees and financial support by the state was viewed by many key informants as evidence of a positive change in the means to deal with the problems of the open door philosophy.

The Open Door Philosophy in 1981

Key informants were asked the stated reasons and the real reasons (if different) for opposition to the open door philosophy in 1981. Key informants were also asked to describe Florida's open door of the 1980s and contrast those who will be served with those who were served during the period 1957 to 1980. Key informants were also asked to rate the following: (a) satisfaction with the open door philosophy in 1981, (b) importance of specific programs and values, and (c) the likelihood that selected policies will be implemented by statute.

The key informants reported that the stated reasons for opposing the open door philosophy in 1981 were a concern with increasing the quality of education and a concern for saving taxpayers' money. The key informants indicated that the real reasons for opposing the open door philosophy involved the competition with other education institutions, the denying of education to all but those with academic talent in order to cut directly the numbers of students attending college and thereby save money, and the belief that college training

should be strictly for those with academic talent.

The majority of key informants were of the opinion that the open door philosophy as it existed through the 1970s will not continue through the 1980s. The application of predetermined standards through testing and application of legislatively established enrollment limits in specific programs were believed by a number of key informants to be the primary policy changes in the 1980s that will impact the open door philosophy. One key informant stated that the changes will be made by making the room smaller rather than closing the door itself. Another key informant stated that emphasis will shift to the will and desire of the individual student to obtain an education as opposed to the responsibility of the institution to provide an education. The institution's role in determining student success will decrease. A few key informants stated the belief that the open door philosophy would not change to any great extent from the way it has existed. One key informant stated that the desires of individuals to obtain college training would insure the continuation of educational access and opportunity policies.

Table 4 shows the frequency of the key informants' ratings of policy maker and citizen satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the open door philosophy in 1981. Dissatisfaction was indicated only in the aspect of the open door philosophy concerned with providing effective counseling services. No dissatisfaction was indicated with any other aspect.

There was an indication by the key informants of a change in the importance of certain programs and aspects of the open door since 1957. Table 5 shows the frequency of the key informants' ratings pertaining to

Table 4

Frequency of Citizen and Policy-Maker Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with the Open Door Philosophy in 1981 as Rated by Key Informants

	Citizen			Policy-Maker		
	Satisfaction	Dissatisfaction	(No response)	Satisfaction	Dissatisfaction	(No response)
Provide educational opportunity to all persons	11	0	0	10	1	0
Provide financial accessibility	10	1	0	10	1	0
Provide geographic accessibility	11	0	0	11	0	0
Provide a diversity of programs	9	1	1	7	3	1
Provide effective counseling services	5	4	2	4	5	2

Table 5

Ratings by Key Informants Pertaining to Whether Specific Programs or Values Were Less or More Important to the Average Citizen and to the Policy Maker Since 1957

Program or Values	Frequency					
	Average citizen			Policy Maker		
	Less	More	(No response)	Less	More	(No Response)
Vocational technical preparation	0	10	0	0	9	1
College parallel program	2	7	1	2	7	1
Adult education	3	7	0	6	4	0
Remedial education	2	8	0	6	4	0
Access to all persons	4	6	0	8	2	0
Geographic accessibility	2	6	2	3	5	2
Financial accessibility	1	8	1	4	5	1
Diversity of programs	2	8	0	6	4	0
Effective counseling services	0	8	2	3	5	2
Innovative teaching and educational programs	6	4	0	6	4	0
Achieving minimal competency in basic skills	1	9	0	1	9	0
Providing retraining opportunities for those whose skills are out of date	0	10	0	1	9	0
Accountability in both teaching and management of college	1	9	0	1	9	0

whether specific programs or values were less important or more important to the average citizen and to the policy makers since 1957. The key informants perceived all programs or values, except innovative teaching, to be more important to the average citizen since 1957. The key informants perceived all programs or values except adult education, remedial education, access to all persons, diversity of programs, and innovative teaching to be more important to the policy makers since 1957. Table 6 shows the frequency of ratings by the key informants of the importance of specific programs or values to policy makers in 1981. The value of achieving minimal competency in basic skills was considered by the key informants to be of very large importance to policy makers. Vocational/technical preparation was considered to be of large importance. The key informants perceived that policy makers placed a large importance upon providing retraining opportunity for those whose skills are out of date. They also placed large importance upon policy makers' being accountable in both the teaching and management of college.

Table 7 shows the frequency of ratings by the key informants of the likelihood that selected policies will be implemented in the future. This rating of likelihood possibly indicates a degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with policies from 1957 to 1981. The key informants rated the likelihood of enrollment caps for institutions, limits concerning branch expansion, tuition regulated by the legislature, and standards which determine educational progress as being large.

Table 6

Ratings by Key Informants of the Importance of Specific Programs and Values to the Policy-Maker in 1981

	Frequency of rating							
	(0) None	(1) Small	(2) Very Small	(3) Some	(4) Large	(5) Very Large	Mean	N
Vocational technical preparation	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.9	11
College parallel program	0	0	0	6	4	1	3.5	11
Adult education	0	2	2	5	2	0	2.6	11
Remedial education	1	1	2	3	4	0	2.7	11
Access to all persons	0	1	2	3	5	0	3.1	11
Geographic accessibility	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.2	11
Financial accessibility	0	0	3	5	3	0	3.0	11
Diversity of programs	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.2	11
Effective counseling services	0	0	1	6	4	0	3.2	11
Innovative teaching and educational programs	0	2	4	2	3	0	2.5	11
Achieving minimal competency in basic skills	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.1	11
Providing retraining opportunities for those whose skills are out of date	0	0	2	1	7	1	3.6	11
Accountability in both teaching and management of college	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.2	11

Table 7
Ratings by Key Informants of the Likelihood Selected Policies Will be Implemented by Statute in the Future

Selected policies	Frequency of rating (0) None	(1) Small	(2) Very Small	(3) Some	(4) Large	(5) Very Large	Mean	N
Enrollment caps for institutions	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.7	11
Funding reductions	1	2	4	2	1	1	2.3	11
Criteria describing curriculum relevancy	0	3	2	3	2	1	2.6	11
Increased centralized control of institutions	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.6	11
Entrance criteria for institutions based upon minimal test scores on entrance tests	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.3	11
Entrance criteria for institutions based upon past demonstration of academic merit	1	2	2	4	2	0	2.4	11
Increase in the application of entrance criteria for admission to certain programs	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.2	11
Increase in the attempts to formulate standards which determine educational progress	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.9	11
Limitations concerning the number of times a person may take a course	1	2	2	4	2	0	2.4	11
Increased tuition	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.7	11
Tuition regulated by the legislature	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.9	11
Limits concerning branch expansion	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.3	11
Other:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11

SUMMARY

The results of the interviews with the key informants revealed that the system of community-junior colleges in Florida was established because of the recognition by policy makers of several pressing needs of the state concerning the offering of educational opportunity to its citizens subsequent to World War II. The system was also established in keeping with the existing trends in postsecondary education during the middle 1950s.

The key informants stated that the open door philosophy was established for two equally important reasons: (a) to provide geographic and financial access to persons of limited economic resources, and (b) to ensure access to higher education to all graduates of Florida high schools.

The policy statement which provided the direction for the offering of educational opportunity to the citizens of Florida was the master plan, written in 1957. The master plan was believed by the key informants to have been the result of rational planning to meet the needs of the citizens of Florida, and represented a very large change in the effort of the state to provide educational opportunity to the citizens of Florida.

Between 1957 and 1981, key informant ratings of the extent of support of the open door by policy makers, documents, or other pheonomena (Tables 2 and 3) had changed. The rated support by the governor and by the legislature was less in 1981 than in 1957. Ratings of policy document support was less in 1981 than in 1957. The belief that the open door philosophy was the best policy choice was rated as being less of a contribution of the implementation of the open door philosophy in 1981 than in 1957.

During the early implementation of the open door philosophy, key informants reported that the open door philosophy was generally associated with the portion of the master plan concerned with the geographic establishment of the 28 campuses. They indicated that completion of the campuses in the late 1960s was taken by many policy makers as a signal for the completion of the master plan. Thus, the implementation of the open door philosophy was considered complete at this time.

The key informants stated that the open door philosophy was not established out of dissatisfaction with existing conditions or policies. The existing conditions were viewed instead as a challenge to the policy makers of the state. The key informants stated that the open door philosophy of the master plan represented the most efficient method of meeting the existing needs and conditions of the state. No evidence was found to indicate dissatisfaction with the open door philosophy before 1970. On the contrary, the key informants described a strong, conscientious effort by policy makers to follow the master plan. The key informants were of the opinion that sometime in the early 1970s the master plan had been completed. Many key informants also indicated that about this time there were feelings of uneasiness about the acceptance of the open door policy among policy makers. The uneasiness and other problems with the open door did not cause dissatisfaction with the open door philosophy.

The key informants reported that a number of social or economic changes occurred in both the country and the state which somewhat changed the nature of the problems and the available means of dealing with them. Each change

either created a problem in implementing the open door or served to underline the need for the open door philosophy, or both. The problems of making the open door philosophy work did not really change during the period 1957 to 1981. What changed was the environment and the people that the open door philosophy served. Social and technological changes in society necessitated that more and more people utilize postsecondary education. The demand for services on postsecondary education created demands on the community-junior colleges which utilized the open door philosophy. Much growth occurred. At the same time there was a change in many attitudes of policy makers. These policy makers were concerned with financing postsecondary education for the enormous numbers of persons demanding opportunity and also were concerned with program standards or entrance and exit criteria.

Reports by key informants indicated that there was no strong recognition by policymakers of a pressing need to provide educational opportunity in 1981, even though reported societal changes since 1957 had indicated the need for a greater number of persons to utilize postsecondary education. The fact that the policy makers did not recognize the need resulted in a policy of omissions; there is no current policy statement emphasing educational opportunity in Florida. What is reported as existing in 1981 was an ill defined expression of dissatisfaction with the open door policies and an alternative concern with the issues of increased "quality" and saving of "taxpayer" dollars.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Support for the open door philosophy in 1981 has lessened since 1957. Both political support and justification for the philosophy were perceived as less in 1981 than in 1957.
2. There has been a change in the focus on the major problems of making the open door philosophy work. The major problems no longer involve the establishment of the system of community colleges, the programs related to the colleges, or the establishment of the campuses of the colleges. The current problems focus upon financing the system of community colleges and teaching the unprepared student.
3. There has been a number of social and economic changes in the state since 1957 which altered the community college population and created growth problems for the system of community colleges. These changes directly impacted the provision of educational opportunity and the philosophy of the open door.
4. The changes in the involvement of the state in accrediting educational programs as well as the changes in the economic conditions of the state also impacted the open door philosophy by shifting the focus of the state from providing opportunity to providing standards for education.
5. Current opposition to the open door philosophy is indirect in nature and focuses upon the providing of quality education and the saving of money to taxpayers rather than opposition to the open door itself.

Implications

The open door philosophy was implemented in response to the needs of the State of Florida to provide educational opportunity to the citizens of the state. The philosophy was an integral part of the master plan for the community colleges of the state. Because it was a part of the master plan, policy makers felt that the open door philosophy was successfully implemented along with the completion of the master plan and establishment of the 28 community college districts.

There have been a number of changes in the State of Florida and in society in general since 1957. Although the system of community colleges has provided opportunity to the citizens of the state through the open door philosophy, these changes have increased the need for the state to provide educational opportunity. The demand for services and education has resulted in growth problems for the system of community colleges.

It appears ironic that the response to increased demands for education and the growth problems of the system do not focus upon making the system more efficient to provide greater output. The state's response to the growth problems of the system has been to apply "standards" and enrollment "caps" to programs and to institutions in an attempt to limit growth and enrollment. However, this response appears contrary to the social and technological changes as well as to the population growth of the state. The question remaining is whether it will be of benefit to the state to apply standards and enrollment caps in a society that must be concerned with providing increasing work opportunities for skilled minorities

and women, in a society that demands that both adults in a family hold jobs, in a society that demands constant retraining of workers, and in a society where an increasing number of minorities and women are demanding training.

Currently, other priorities such as "quality" and the saving of tax payer dollars are perceived as being of higher priority than providing educational opportunity utilizing the open door philosophy. The priority assumes that there are distinct, separate, and possibly opposing policies.

It could be argued that these are not distinct, separate, nor opposing policies. It could be argued that the proper application of criterion standards upon program completion is not in opposition to the policy of providing educational opportunity to all by insuring access to programs and institutions. The educational environment of the institution and the criterion test of program essentials would provide the same select and sort function that most policy makers are apparently demanding, without resorting to the application of entry level standards based upon questionable merit and validity, that limit educational access.

It could also be argued that providing educational opportunity by breaking the access and motivational barriers to education, is indeed, the most efficient use of the taxpayer dollar. The immediate savings of taxpayer dollars by limiting enrollments is wasteful in the long run in terms of utilizing human resources to their maximum.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW GUIDE AND RATINGS USED WITH KEY INFORMANTS

1. Describe the open door philosophy of Florida's community colleges as it was originally proposed? What population was it designed to serve?

2. Was the open door philosophy established because there was dissatisfaction with existing conditions or policies or for other reasons? What really brought about the establishment of the open door in Florida?

3. Was there a conscientious effort by policy makers to follow the master plan? How long did the effort last and what brought a halt to the efforts if there was a halt?

4. How strong was the initial support for the open door philosophy among policy makers and citizens?

5. What social or economic changes have occurred within the state or country since 1957 which have affected the open door philosophy?

6. How have the problems of making the open door work changed since 1957?

7. What are the stated reasons, and what are the real reasons, if different, to opposing the open door philosophy in 1981?

8. Describe Florida's open door of the 1980's. Contrast who will be served with who was served during the period 1957 to 1981.

1. Rate the extent to which each contributed to the implementation and support of the open door philosophy of community colleges in 1957.

	None	Very Small	Small	Some	Large	Very Large
The governor	0	1	2	3	4	5
The legislature						
Citizens	0	1	2	3	4	5
The state universities	0	1	2	3	4	5
The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) entitled Higher Education in American Democracy	0	1	2	3	4	5
The master plan for Florida's system of community colleges (1957) entitled The Community/Junior College in Florida's Future	0	1	2	3	4	5
The need to shift the emphasis of the open door admissions from universities to the community colleges	0	1	2	3	4	5
Demands from employers for skilled workers	0	1	2	3	4	5
The projected needs of the state for skilled workers	0	1	2	3	4	5
Peer pressure of policy makers	0	1	2	3	4	5
General consensus among policy makers that the open door philosophy represented the best policy choice at the time	0	1	2	3	4	5
Conscientious effort by policy makers to provide educational opportunity to all persons	0	1	2	3	4	5

2. Rate the extent to which each contributed to the support of the open door philosophy of community colleges in 1981.

	None	Very Small	Small	Some	Large	Very Large
The governor	0	1	2	3	4	5
The legislature	0	1	2	3	4	5
Citizens	0	1	2	3	4	5
The state universities	0	1	2	3	4	5
The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) entitled Higher Education in American Democracy	0	1	2	3	4	5
The master plan for Florida's system of community colleges (1957) entitled The Community/Junior College in Florida's Future	0	1	2	3	4	5
The need to shift the emphasis of the open door admissions from universities to the community colleges	0	1	2	3	4	5
Demands from employers for skilled workers	0	1	2	3	4	5
The projected needs of the state for skilled workers	0	1	2	3	4	5
Peer pressure of policy makers	0	1	2	3	4	5
General consensus among policy makers that the open door philosophy represented the best policy choice at the time	0	1	2	3	4	5
Conscientious effort by policy makers to provide educational opportunity to al persons	0	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please indicate citizen and policy-maker satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the open door philosophy in 1981.

	None	Very Small	Small	Some	Large	Very Large
Provide educational opportunity to all persons	0	1	2	3	4	5
Provide financial accessibility	0	1	2	3	4	5
Provide geographic accessibility	0	1	2	3	4	5
Provide a diversity of programs	0	1	2	3	4	5
Provide effective counseling services	0	1	2	3	4	5

4. Are the following less important or more important to the policy-maker and to the average citizen since 1957? Rate their importance to the policy-maker in 1981.

	Average Citizen	Policy Maker	None	Very Little	Little	Some	Large	Very Large
Vocational technical preparation	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
College parallel program	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Adult education	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Remedial education	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Access to all persons	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Geographic accessibility	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Financial accessibility	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Diversity of programs	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Effective counseling services	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Innovative teaching and educational programs	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Achieving minimal competency in basic skills	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Providing retraining opportunities for those whose skills are out of date	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5
Accountability in both teaching and management of college	L M	L M	0	1	2	3	4	5

5. Rate the likelihood that the following policies will be implemented by statute in the future.

	None	Very Small	Small	Some	Large	Very Large
Enrollment caps for institutions	0	1	2	3	4	5
Funding reductions	0	1	2	3	4	5
Criteria describing curriculum relevancy	0	1	2	3	4	5
Increased centralized control of institutions	0	1	2	3	4	5
Entrance criteria for institutions based upon minimal test scores on entrance tests	0	1	2	3	4	5
Entrance criteria for institutions based upon past demonstration of academic merit	0	1	2	3	4	5
Increase in the application of entrance criteria for admission to certain programs	0	1	2	3	4	5
Increase in the attempts to formulate standards which determine educational progress	0	1	2	3	4	5
Limitations concerning the number of times a person may take a course	0	1	2	3	4	5
Increased tuition	0	1	2	3	4	5
Tuition regulated by the legislature	0	1	2	3	4	5
Limits concerning branch expansion	0	1	2	3	4	5
Other	0	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS AND THEIR POSITIONS OR FORMER POSITIONS

Michael M. Bennett	Former president, St. Petersburg Junior College.
Myron R. Blee	Former chief of the Bureau of Program Support and Services, Division of Community Colleges; former president, Broward Community College; former educational and research officer, State Board of Control; former associate to the director of the staff for the Council for the Study of Higher Education in Florida.
Thomas LeRoy Collins	Former governor of the State of Florida; former member and chairman of the Senate Education Committee, State Senate; former member, State House of Representatives.
J. Broward Culpepper	Former member, Community College Council; former executive director, State Board of Control.
Lee G. Henderson	Director, Division of Community Colleges, Florida Department of Education; former assistant director, Division of Community Colleges.
Frederick H. Kent	Former chairman, Board of Trustees, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville; former member and chairman, State Junior College Board; former member, State Board of Control.
G.T. "Doc" Melton	Former member and chairman of the Senate Education Committee, State Senate.
Samuel R. Neel, Jr.	Former president, Manatee Junior College.
Herbert E. Phillips	President, Lake City Community College.
Charles B. Reed	Deputy chief of staff, Executive Office of the Governor of the State of Florida.

Alan J. Robertson	President, Santa Fe Community College; former chairman, Board of Trustees, Edison Community College.
David G. Robinson	President, Edison Community College.
T. Terrell Sessums	Member, Board of Regents; former member, State House of Representatives.
Ralph D. Turlington	Commissioner of education; former member, speaker of the house and chairman of the House Education Committee, State House of Representatives.

REFERENCES

Braziel, D., & Crane, M. "Open door" policy gets low marks. The Gainesville Sun, August 23, 1981, pp. 1A, 12A.

Community College Council. The community/junior college in Florida's future. Tallahassee, Florida: State Board of Education, 1957.

Henderson, L.N. Application of the theory of incrementalism to statutory changes in the open door philosophy of Florida's community colleges, 1957 to 1982. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1982).

McCabe, R.H. Now is the time to reform the American community college. Community and Junior College Journal, 1981, 51(8), 6-8.

Wattenbarger, J., & Cage, R. More money for more opportunity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

SEP 3 1982

END

DEPT. OF HEW

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

NOV. 29 .1982